



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,398	01/02/2002	K. Ranji Vaidyanathan	003248.00041	8382

22908 7590 12/12/2006

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
TEN SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
SUITE 3000
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

BARRETT, THOMAS C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3738

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/038,398

Applicant(s)

VAIDYANATHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas C. Barrett

Art Unit

3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-13 and 15-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9,10 and 16-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,11-13,15 and 25-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION
REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION

The request filed on October 23, 2006 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 10/038,398 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 4-13, and 15-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 11-13, 15, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claims are directed to a **resorbable** composition that provides load-bearing support for natural bone structure for "a **predetermined** period of time" however the disclosure fails to provide how to predetermine the said period of time. One of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to determine or

Art Unit: 3738

predetermine how long a polybutyleneterephthalate or polyethyletherketone matrix would provide said support. A search of PEEK and PBT within the art shows that they are considered non-resorbable, such as Huckle et al (2004/0010320 A1: paragraph 0030) or Moumene et al (2003/0065393 A1: paragraph 0076).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4-8 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 4 is dependent on a canceled claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Please note that the priority date of the present invention is January 2, 2002. The provisional applications cited fail to disclose polyglycolic acid, polylactic acid-polyglycolic acid copolymer or their combination with polycaprolactone.

In addition, it is requested that the Applicant supply copies of any handouts or other pertinent information in relation to "Symposium Y" if available.

Art Unit: 3738

Claims 11-13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walish et al. (Symposium Y) in view of DeBruijn et al. (6,228,117 B1) in further view of Vyakarnam et al. (6,534,084). Walish et al. discloses a biocompatible osteoinductive implant comprising a porous composition however Walish et al. fails to disclose a specific porosity and pore size. Vyakarnam et al. teaches an implant having a porosity of 50-60% and pores sized between about 150 to about 400 microns, which would be similar to the naturally occurring structure (col. 5, line 66- col. 6, line 41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of an implant having a porosity of 50-60% and pores sized between about 150 to about 400 microns, as taught by Vyakarnam et al., to a biocompatible osteoinductive implant as per Walish et al., in order to better approximate the naturally occurring structure.

Claims 25-26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walish et al. (Symposium Y) in view of DeBruijn et al. (6,228,117 B1) in further view of Kumar (2002/0127391 A1). Walish et al. discloses a biocompatible osteoinductive implant comprising a porous composition however Walish et al. fails to disclose the polymer-ceramic composition comprising polylactic acid. Kumar teaches an implant having a coating comprising a ceramic-polylactic acid composition (0024). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of an implant having a coating comprising a ceramic-polylactic acid composition, as taught by Kumar, to a biocompatible osteoinductive implant as per Walish et al., for resorption after implantation.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas C. Barrett whose telephone number is (571) 272-47464746. The examiner can normally be reached Tuesday-Friday between Mon.-Fri. from 9:00-5:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (571) 272-4754272-4754. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thomas C. Barrett
Examiner
Art Unit 3738



TOM BARRETT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700